REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 28, 2009, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-33, and 35-43 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 23, and 34 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims under § 112

Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-33, and 35-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. The Office, in particular, asserts that some claim features are contradictory and, thus, indefinite.

The Assignee finds a typographical error in independent claim 1. Independent claim is thus amended to cure this error.

The Assignee, though, sees no contradiction in the remaining independent claims. The independent claims recite "*at least one computer access setting comprising a listing of prohibited computer applications to which access is denied, one version of the at least one computer access setting being stored in a remote database and another version of the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer*" (emphasis added). The independent claims also recite "*when the requested computer application is found in the another version of the computer access settings, then the control unit prohibits opening the window*" (emphasis added). There are two versions of access settings, and the second version (*e.g.*, the "*another*" version) is queried. The Assignee thus sees no contradiction in the remaining independent claims. The Assignee thus respectfully asserts that the pending claims completely satisfy § 112, so the Assignee thus respectfully requests removal of this rejection.

Rejection of Claims over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-24, 26-31, 33-35, and 37-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/0242685 to Heard, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent 7,047,258 to Balogh, *et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0233482 to Skrepetos.

These claims, though, are not obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*. These claims recite, or incorporate, many features that are not disclosed or suggested by the proposed combination of *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites "*monitoring a request to launch a computer application ..., the control unit intercepting a message for opening a window ... to prohibit opening the window, the control unit querying the another version of the computer access settings for the requested computer application, and when the requested computer application is found in the another version of the computer access settings, then the control unit prohibits opening the window associated with the requested computer application to terminate the launch*" (emphasis added). Independent claims 11, 22, and 33 recite similar features.

These features are not obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*. Both *Heard* and *Balogh* have been discussed in previous responses, so no detailed discussion is necessary. The Office concedes that both *Heard* and *Balogh* fail to teach or suggest "*monitoring a request to launch a computer* application" and the interception of messages "*to prohibit opening the window.*"

Now the Office cites to *Skrepetos*. The Office asserts that *Skrepetos* cures the deficiencies of *Heard* and *Balogh*, and the Office cites to several of *Skrepetos's* paragraphs. The Office, though, is mistaken. The Office has, very respectfully, misinterpreted *Skrepetos*. When *Skrepetos* is properly interpreted, the combined teaching of *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos* blocks Uniform Resource Locators, not "*requested computer applications,*" as the independent claims recite.

The Office, for example, cites to *Skrepetos's* paragraph [0027], which is reproduced below:

> [0027] At decision block 406, **a determination is made whether the <u>URL</u> of the window corresponding to the event is a <u>URL</u> specifically listed as an <u>allowed URL</u>**. If the <u>URL</u> of the window is an allowed <u>URL</u>, processing advances to block 414. At block 414, process 400 returns to decision block 214 of process 200 shown in FIG. 2. However, if the <u>URL</u> is not specifically allowed, then it may still need to be blocked and processing proceeds to decision block 408.

Skrepetos's paragraph [0027] explains how windows associated with Uniform Resource Locators are blocked. *Skrepetos's* paragraph [0027] fails to teach or suggest "*monitoring a <u>request to launch a computer application</u>,*" "*querying the another version of the computer access settings for the <u>requested computer application</u>,*" and "*when the <u>requested computer application</u> is found in the another version of the computer access settings, then the control unit prohibits opening the window associated with the <u>requested computer application</u> to terminate the launch*" (emphasis added). *Skrepetos*, quite simply, does not teach what the Office asserts.

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-24, 26-31, 33-35, and 37-42, then, are not obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*. Independent claims 1, 11, 22, and 33 recite many features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*. Their respective dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that the pending claims are obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos*. The Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

Rejection of Claims over *Heard, Balogh, Skrepetos & Dunn*

Claims 3, 10, 14, 21, 25, 32, 36, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos* and further in view of 7,076,558 to Dunn. These claims, however, cannot be obvious over the proposed combination of *Heard*, *Balogh*, *Skrepetos* and *Dunn*. These claims depend, respectively from independent claim 1, 11, 22, and 33. These claims, then, incorporate the same distinguishing features and recite additional features. As the

above paragraphs already explained, *Heard*, *Balogh*, and *Skrepetos* all fail to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 11, 22, and 33, and *Dunn* does not cure these deficiencies. The combined teaching of *Heard*, *Balogh*, *Skrepetos* and *Dunn* still fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1, 11, 22, and 33.   Claims 3, 10, 14, 21, 25, 32, 36, and 43, then, are not obvious over *Heard*, *Balogh*, *Skrepetos* and *Dunn*, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

If any questions arise, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or *scott@scottzimmerman.com*.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390